

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. AVAN/001109

**REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 8, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 8, 2005. Claims 1-7 and 14-26 were examined. The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito (U.S. 5,994,643). The Examiner rejected claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Saito. The Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in combination with Chang (U.S. 5,153,380). The Examiner rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in combination with Chang as applied in claim 23 and further in combination with Shu (U.S. 4,567,318).

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 4 and 16 due to informalities. In response, Applicants have amended claims 4 and 16 accordingly. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the claims be removed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito. In response, Applicants have amended claim 14.

As amended, claim 14 includes the limitation of a module housing having a cavity with an upper wall, a side wall and a lower wall, the module housing further having a knife-shaped edge that bites into a bottom surface of the lid when the lid is pressed onto the module housing to form a metal-to-metal contact sealing mechanism, wherein the lid and the module housing are held together when a portion of the lid enters into the cavity and forms a holding pressure point proximate the upper wall of the cavity that interlocks the lid and the module housing. Saito does not disclose a module housing having a knife-shaped edge that bites into a bottom surface of a lid when the lid is pressed onto the module housing to form a metal-to-metal contact sealing mechanism. Further, Saito does not disclose a module housing having a cavity with an upper wall, a side wall and a lower wall, wherein a lid and the module housing are held together when a portion of the lid enters into the cavity and forms a holding pressure point proximate the

Page 5

405662\_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. AVAN/001109

upper wall of the cavity that interlocks the lid and the module housing. Rather, Saito discloses frame (1) with a groove (14) defined by a horizontal surface (12), an inclined surface (13) and a vertical surface (9), wherein the vertical portion (9) of the groove (14) interacts with a portion of a lid (7) to secure the lid (7) to the frame (1). Saito clearly teaches a groove (14) rather than a cavity as recited in claim 14. Saito therefore fails to teach each and every limitation of claim 14, and this failure prevents Saito from anticipating claim 14. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 14 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claim 14. Additionally, claim 24 depends from claim 14 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Saito. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 25 and 26 depend from amended claim 14. As set forth above, Saito fails to teach or suggest all the limitations in amended claim 14. This failure precludes Saito from rendering claims 25 and 26 obvious. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 25 and 26 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

The Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in combination with Chang. Applicants have cancelled claim 23, thereby obviating the rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in combination with Chang as applied in claim 23 and further in combination with Shu. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 15-21 depend from claim 14. As set forth above, Saito fails to teach or suggest a module housing having a cavity with an upper wall, a side wall and a lower wall, wherein a holding pressure point proximate the upper wall of the cavity interlocks the lid and the module housing. Neither, Chang or Shu cures the deficiencies of Saito. This failure precludes the combination of Saito and Chang and Shu from rendering claims 15-21 obvious. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 15-21 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. AVAN001109

Allowable Subject Matter


The Examiner indicated that claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 are allowed. Applicants appreciate allowance of claims 1, 2, 6, and 7.

The Examiner indicated that claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under Claim Objections, set forth in this Office Action. As discussed above, Applicants have amended claims 4 and 5. Therefore, Applicants believe claims 4 and 5 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter C. Grollitsch

Registration No. 48,678

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicants